arXiv:1407.3413v1 [quant-ph] 12 Jul 2014

Topological and Error-Correcting Properties for Symmetry-Protected Topological Order

Bei Zeng[1, 2, 3] and Duan-Lu Zhou[4]

[1]*Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada*
[2]*Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada*
[3]*Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*
[4]*Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics, and Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

(Dated: July 15, 2014)

We discuss the symmetry-protected topological (SPT) orders for bosonic systems from an information-theoretic viewpoint. We show that with a proper choice of the onsite basis, the degenerate ground-state space of SPT orders (on a manifold with boundary) is a quantum error-correcting code with macroscopic classical distance, hence is stable against any local bit-flip errors. We show that this error-correcting property of the SPT orders has a natural connection to that of the symmetry-breaking orders, whose degenerate ground-state space is a classical error-correcting code with a macroscopic distance, providing a new angle for the hidden symmetry-breaking properties in SPT orders. We propose new types of topological entanglement entropy that probe the STP orders hidden in their symmetric ground states, which also signal the topological phase transitions protected by symmetry. Combined with the original definition of topological entanglement entropy that probes the 'intrinsic topological orders', and the recent proposed one that probes the symmetry-breaking orders, the set of different types of topological entanglement entropy may hence distinguish topological orders, SPT orders, and symmetry-breaking orders, which may be mixed up in a single system.

Introduction – Symmetry protected topological (STP) orders are gapped phases of matter with certain symmetry and only short-range entanglement. It has been a focus of the recent studies in condensed matter physics due to the excitement of the new experimental advances in topological insulators and superconductors [1]. The classification of free fermionic STP phases are well understood [2]. The situation of the interacting systems are more complicated, with extensively recent discussions for both the bosonic case [3–6] and the fermionic case [7–9].

While many recent literatures are focusing on the symmetry aspects of the STP orders, we would like to examine more details regarding the topological properties of these systems from an information-theoretic viewpoint. We start with the discussion of bosonic systems in one spatial dimension (1D), where the gapped ground states of local Hamiltonians are extensively studied [10–12].

It is well-known that for a 1D gapped Hamiltonian, the ground states obey entanglement area law [10–15] and can be faithfully represented by the matrix product states (MPS) [16]. When the ground state is unique, the MPS representation has injective matrices and can be adiabatically connected to an isometric form (as shown in Fig. 1(a), for periodic boundary conditions) via a renormalization procedure (with possibly blocking of sites) [11, 13].

Consider a system with n sites hence total $2n$ (virtual) qubits, and the quantum state of the system in Fig. 1(a) can be written as $|\Psi_a\rangle = \otimes_i |w\rangle_{i_r,(i+1)_l}$, where the label i denotes sites, and the subscript l/r of the site i denotes the left/right (virtual) qubit in the site. If one further applies a two-site unitary transformation on each bond, the system can be disentangled to a product state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 2n}$.

In order to reveal properly the nontrivial topological properties of the system, certain symmetry is needed to prevent the system from going to a trivial product state, which is the meaning of 'symmetry protection'. The distinct topological feature of an SPT state, for instance the state $|\Psi_a\rangle$, is that when putting on a 1D chain with boundary, each boundary carries an unpaired qubit, hence the corresponding Hamiltonian has a 4-fold degenerate ground state. This is very different from the state $|\Psi_b\rangle = \otimes_i |w\rangle_{i_l,i_r}$ as illustrated in Fig. 1(b), by shifting $|\Psi_a\rangle$ by a (virtual) qubit. $|\Psi_b\rangle$ essentially is a product state of onsite wave functions, and does not carry any unpaired qubit on a 1D chain with boundary.



FIG. 1: The MPS isometric form. The circles represent sites and the black dots represent (virtual) qubits (for simplicity we consider the qubit case, and our discussions naturally generalize to the qudit case). Two adjacent qubits connected by a line represent a bond, which is given by $|w\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$. (a) Each site containing two qubits as label by l (left) and r (right). (b) Shifting the system by one (virtual) qubit.

$|\Psi_b\rangle$ clearly has the same symmetry as $|\Psi_a\rangle$. However, when certain symmetry is respected (e.g. $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$), $|\Psi_a\rangle$ cannot be adiabatically connected to $|\Psi_b\rangle$ without a phase transition. This phase transition is in this sense topological, which however needs the symmetry protection to happen. It is shown that the underlying reason for $|\Psi_a\rangle$ to be different from $|\Psi_b\rangle$ is that they carry different projective representations of the symmetry group, and theories based on the group cohomology may be used to distinguish different SPT

phases [11, 13].

In this work, we propose a new approach to the theory of SPT orders from an information-theoretic viewpoint. We show that, under a proper choice of onsite basis, the degenerate ground-state space is a quantum error-correcting code with a macroscopic classical distance, hence is stable against any local bit-flip errors. This error-correcting property has a natural connection to that of the symmetry-breaking orders, whose degenerate ground-state space is a classical error-correcting code with a macroscopic distance. Our approach hence provides a new angle for the hidden symmetry-breaking properties in SPT orders [17–21].

We further propose new types of topological entanglement entropy, which probe the STP orders and signal the topological phase transitions protected by symmetry. Our new types of topological entanglement entropy are defined on a manifold with boundary, which can probe the topological properties hidden in the symmetric ground states.

Error-Correcting Properties – To examine the error-correcting properties for SPT orders, it is convenient to transform the MPS isometric form into the cluster state model by an onsite transformation. Notice that the bond state $|w\rangle_{i_r,(i+1)_l}$ is a two-qubit stabilizer state with the stabilizer generators $\{X_{i_r}X_{(i+1)_l}, Z_{i_r}Z_{(i+1)_l}\}$. Now on each site, we apply the transformation

$$U_i = CNOT_{i_l,i_r}H_{i_r}, \tag{1}$$

where $CNOT_{i_l,i_r}$ is the controlled-NOT operation with the i_lth qubit as the control qubit, and H_{i_r} is the Hadamard transformation on the i_rth qubit.

After the transformation $\prod_i U_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i_r}X_{(i+1)_l} &\to Z_{i_r}X_{(i+1)_l}Z_{(i+1)_r} \\ Z_{i_r}Z_{(i+1)_l} &\to Z_{i_l}X_{i_r}Z_{(i+1)_l}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which is the stabilizer generators for a 1D cluster state [22] of $2n$ qubits.

Without loss of generality we now consider a 1D qubit system of N qubits, with N not necessarily even. And without confusion we label each qubit by j. The 1D cluster state hence corresponds to the stabilizer group with generators $\{Z_{j-1}X_jZ_{j+1}\}$, and the corresponding Hamiltonian

$$H_{clu} = -\sum_j Z_{j-1}X_jZ_{j+1}. \tag{3}$$

For a 1D ring without boundary, the ground state of H_{clu} is unique. For a chain with boundary, where the summation index j runs from 2 to $N-1$, the ground state is then 4-fold degenerate. We can also view the degenerate ground-state space as a quantum error-correcting code encoding two qubits. As a quantum code, it has only distance 1, as Z_1 commutes with all the stabilizer generators.

What we are interested in here is the ability of this code for correcting classical errors (bit flip), which corresponds to errors that are tensor products of X_js. It is straightforward to see that the two logical operators which are in the form of tensor products of X_js are

$$\bar{X}_1 = \prod_k X_{2k-1}, \quad \bar{X}_2 = \prod_k X_{2k}, \tag{4}$$

with k runs from 1 to $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$, and to interpret $\prod_k X_{2k-1}$ containing also a product with X_N if N is odd. This code hence has classical distance $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$, which is a macroscopic distance that is half of the system size.

Another way to view $\bar{X}_1$ and $\bar{X}_2$ is that they generate the group $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ that preserves the topological order of the system [23]. Any local perturbation respecting the symmetry cannot lift the ground state degeneracy (in the thermodynamical limit) [23–25].

One way to view this symmetry protection is to add a magnetic field along the X direction to the system, and the corresponding Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{clu}(B) = -\sum_j Z_{j-1}X_jZ_{j+1} + B\sum_j X_j. \tag{5}$$

It is known that there is a phase transition at $B = 1$ (for periodic boundary condition) [24–26].

It is interesting to compare the system $H_{clu}(B)$ with a symmetry-breaking ordered Hamiltonian

$$H_{syb}(B) = -\sum_j Z_{j-1}Z_{j+1} + B\sum_j X_j, \tag{6}$$

with the same symmetry $\mathbb{D}_2$ given by $\bar{X}_1$, $\bar{X}_2$. The degenerate ground-state space of $H_{syb}(0)$ is a classical error-correcting code with distance $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$, and is spanned by

$$|0000\ldots00\rangle, |0101\ldots01\rangle, |1010\ldots10\rangle, |1111\ldots11\rangle. \tag{7}$$

Denote the symmetric ground state of $H_{syb}(B)$ by $|\psi_{syb}(B)\rangle$. Then $|\psi_{syb}(0)\rangle$ is a stabilizer state stabilized by $Z_{j-1}Z_{j+1}$ ($j = 2, \ldots, N-2$) and $\bar{X}_1$, $\bar{X}_2$, and is in fact a equal weight superposition of the basis states of the code as given in Eq. (7). Similarly, we denote the symmetric ground state of $H_{clu}(B)$ by $|\psi_{clu}(B)\rangle$. Then $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$ is a stabilizer state stabilized by $Z_{j-1}X_jZ_{j+1}$ ($j = 2, \ldots, N-2$) and $\bar{X}_1$, $\bar{X}_2$.

There is no local unitary transformation to transform $H_{clu}(B)$ or to $H_{syb}(B)$. One either needs a nonlocal transformation or a local transformation with an unbounded depth, which reveals the hidden symmetry-breaking property of the SPT order [20, 21]. This can also be seen from the fact that the symmetric ground $|\psi_{syb}(0)\rangle$ is long-range entangled, and this long-range property does not change even if closing the boundary. However, the state $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$, although appears to be long-range entangled for a 1D chain with boundary (characterized by logical operators $\bar{X}_1$, $\bar{X}_2$), is essentially short-range entangled when closing the boundary.

That is, $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$ is in fact stabilized by $Z_{j-1}X_jZ_{j+1}$ with a periodic boundary condition [23]. In this sense, viewed as a dimension 0 quantum code, $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$ also has a macroscopic

classical distance (given by the smallest weight element in the stabilizer group which is a tensor product of X_js [27]). Going along the direction respecting the symmetry picks up the symmetric ground state as the exact ground state, which gives rise to the phase transition for both the periodic and open boundary conditions.

Topological Entanglement Entropy – Topological entanglement entropy was first proposed to detect topological orders [28, 29], and is recently generalized to probe the systems with symmetry-breaking orders [30, 31]. Inspired by these previous types of topological entanglement entropy, we introduce new types to probe the SPT orders.

We consider a 1D chain with boundary. For any gapped ground state, and for the cuttings given in Fig. 2, we introduce the topological entanglement entropy

$$S_{topo} = S_{AB} + S_{BC} - S_B - S_{ABC}, \tag{8}$$

where $S(*)$ is the von Neumann entropy of reduced density matrix of the part $*$.

There are two kinds of cuttings introduced in Fig. 2. Fig. 2(a) cuts the system into three parts, and we denote the corresponding topological entanglement entropy by S^t_{topo}. Fig. 2(b) cuts the system into four parts, and we denote the corresponding topological entanglement entropy by S^q_{topo}. We use S_{topo} to refer both S^t_{topo} and S^q_{topo}.



FIG. 2: (a) Cutting a 1D chain into A, B, C parts; (b) Cutting a 1D chain into A, B, C, D parts.

Similarly to the topological entanglement entropy introduced previously, S_{topo} is an invariant of local unitary transformations and $S_{topo} = 0$ for unique gapped ground states [28, 29, 31]. We also know that S_{topo} is quantized for SPT ordered states due to their degenerate entanglement spectrum [32], hence a nonzero S_{topo} is a signature of SPT order. We will show that S_{topo} also signals topological phase transitions protected by symmetry.

We first examine S^t_{topo}. For the ideal state of $B = 0$, $S^t_{topo} = 2$ for both $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$ and $|\psi_{syb}(0)\rangle$. When B increases, for $|\psi_{clu}(B)\rangle$, S^t_{topo} signals the topological phase transition, as shown in Fig. 3. However, the symmetry-breaking order hidden in the exact symmetric ground state $|\psi_{syb}(B)\rangle$ can also be detected by S^t_{topo}. In fact, for the same calculation with $6, 9, 12, 15, 18$ qubits, one gets a very similar figure as Fig. 3.



FIG. 3: S^t_{topo} for the ground state of H_{clu}.

To distinguish SPT orders from a symmetry-breaking one, we can instead use S^q_{topo}. Since the topological entanglement entropy is only carried in the entire wave function of the exact symmetric ground state for symmetry-breaking orders [31], computing S^q_{topo} on its reduced density matrix of parts ABC returns 0.

However, $S^q_{topo} = 2$ for $|\psi_{clu}(0)\rangle$, because the 'topology' of the STP states is essentially carried on the boundary, tracing out part of the bulk has no effect on detecting the topological order. For $|\psi_{clu}(B)\rangle$, S^q_{topo} signals the topological phase transition, as shown in Fig. 4.



FIG. 4: S^q_{topo} for the ground state of H_{clu}.

A mixing order of symmetry-breaking and SPT – There could be also systems containing mixing orders of symmetry-breaking and SPT, whose symmetric ground states correspond to non-injective matrices in the MPS representations, with isometric forms that couple GHZ states with short-ranged bond states [13].

As an example, we consider a stabilizer group generated by $Z_{j-1}X_jX_{j+1}Z_{j+2}$ with j running from 2 to $N-2$, which is a generalization of the 5-qubit code [33, 34] and a special kind of quantum convolutional codes [35]. On a 1D chain with boundary, i.e. for $j = 2, 3, \ldots, N-2$, the Hamiltonian $-\sum_j Z_{j-1}X_jX_{j+1}Z_{j+2}$ has 8-fold ground-state degeneracy.

The ground-state as an error-correcting code has classical distance $\lfloor N/3 \rfloor$, with logical operators $\bar{X}_1 = \prod_k X_{3k-2}$, $\bar{X}_2 = \prod_k X_{3k-2}$, $\bar{X}_3 = \prod_k X_{3k}$. Therefore, if one adds a magnetic field along the X direction, i.e.

$$H_{ZXXZ}(B) = -\sum_j Z_{j-1}X_jX_{j+1}Z_{j+2} + B\sum_j X_j, \quad (9)$$

the orders of the system (either SPT or symmetry-breaking) will be protected.

It turns out that the system combines a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry-breaking order and a $\mathbb{D}_2$ SPT-order. This can be seen from the fact that for $B = 0$, the symmetric ground state has $S^t_{topo} = 3$ and $S^q_{topo} = 2$. S^t_{topo} probes both the symmetry-breaking order and the SPT order, as illustrated in Fig. 5. S^t_{topo} probes only the SPT phase transition, as illustrated in Fig. 6.



FIG. 5: S^t_{topo} the ground state of $H_{ZXXZ}(B)$. For $N = 6$, the maximum value of S^t_{topo} is 2 due to that the system size is too small.



FIG. 6: S^q_{topo} for the ground state of $H_{ZXXZ}(B)$.

Discussion – What Eq. (1) essentially does, is to map the onsite state $|w\rangle_{i_l,i_r}$ illustrated in Fig. 1(b) to a product state of qubits $|+\rangle_{i_l} \otimes |+\rangle_{i_r}$. Here $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ is the eigenvalue 1 eigenstate of X. Because going from the state $|\Psi_a\rangle$ (the state illustrated in Fig. 1(a)) to $|\Psi_b\rangle$ while respecting symmetry will encounter a phase transition, directly interpolating the the cluster state to $|+\rangle^{\otimes 2n}$ (i.e. given by $H_{clu}(B)$) also undergoes a phase transition. Therefore, the onsite transformation $\prod_i U_i$ transforms $|\Psi_b\rangle$ to the symmetric ground state of a quantum error-correcting code with a macroscopic classical distance.

This idea can be generalized to higher spatial dimensions. In a general setting, an SPT ordered state $|\Phi_a\rangle$ is that, when connecting to a product state $|\Phi_b\rangle$ with the same symmetry, a phase transition occurs while respecting the symmetry [36]. One can always apply some onsite unitary transformation to transform $|\Phi_b\rangle$ to a tensor product of $|+\rangle$, hence at the same time transform $|\Phi_a\rangle$ to the symmetric ground state of some quantum error-correcting code with a macroscopic classical distance (for instance the SPT ordered 2D cluster state discussed in [23]).

One may also generalize the idea of different types of topological entanglement entropy to higher spatial dimensions. For instance, in 2D, a straightforward way is to replace the chain by a cylinder with boundary, then use the similar cuttings as in Fig. 2.

One may also consider a disk with boundary. For any gapped ground state (one may need to avoid the situation of a gapless boundary by adding symmetric local terms to the Hamiltonian), still using S_{topo} as given in Eq. (8), one can consider two kinds of cuttings, as given in Fig. 7. Similarly



FIG. 7: (a) Cutting a 2D disk into A, B, C parts; (b) Cutting a 2D disk into A, B, C, D parts.

as the 1D case, the cutting of Fig. 7(a) probes both the symmetry-breaking orders and the STP orders, and the cutting of Fig. 7(a) probes only STP orders.

Notice that the topological entanglement entropy proposed in [30, 31] is defined on a manifold without boundary (e.g. a 1D ring or a 2D sphere), which detects only symmetry-breaking orders but not SPT orders. Combined with the original definition of topological entanglement entropy [28, 29] that probes the 'intrinsic topological orders', and the recent proposed one that probes the symmetry-breaking orders [30, 31], the set of different types of topological entanglement entropy may hence distinguish topological orders, SPT orders, and symmetry-breaking orders, which may be mixed up in a single system.

We hope our discussion adds new ingredients for understanding the microscopic theory of SPT orders.

Acknowledgements – We thank Stephen Bartlett for explaining the hidden symmetry-breaking in SPT orders. We thank Xingshan Cui, Eric Rowell, Zhenghan Wang, and Xiao-Gang Wen for helpful discussions on STP orders. We thank Markus Grassl and Martin Roetteler for helpful discussions on quantum convolutional codes. We are grateful to Yang Liu for providing codes for exact diagonalization. BZ is supported by NSERC. DLZ is supported by NSF of China under Grant No. 11175247, and NKBRSF of China under Grants Nos. 2012CB922104 and 2014CB921202.

[1] X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1057 (Oct 2011)
[2] A. Kitaev, arXiv preprint arXiv:0901.2686(2009)
[3] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Physical Review B **80**, 155131 (2009)
[4] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Science **338**, 1604 (2012)
[5] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Physical Review B **87**, 155114 (2013)
[6] A. Kapustin, arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.1467(2014)
[7] A. M. Turner, F. Pollmann, and E. Berg, Physical Review B **83**, 075102 (2011)
[8] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Physical Review B **83**, 075103 (2011)
[9] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.2648(2012)
[10] M. B. Hastings, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2007**, P08024 (2007)
[11] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Physical Review B **83**, 035107 (2011)
[12] Z. Landau, U. Vazirani, and T. Vidick, arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.5143(2013)
[13] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and I. Cirac, Physical Review B **84**, 165139 (2011)
[14] I. Arad, A. Kitaev, Z. Landau, and U. Vazirani, arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.1162(2013)
[15] Y. Huang, arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.0327(2014)
[16] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Communications in mathematical physics **144**, 443 (1992)
[17] T. Kennedy and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 304 (Jan 1992)
[18] T. Kennedy and H. Tasaki, Communications in mathematical physics **147**, 431 (1992)
[19] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 075125 (Feb 2012)
[20] K. Duivenvoorden and T. Quella, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125115 (Sep 2013)
[21] D. V. Else, S. D. Bartlett, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 085114 (Aug 2013)
[22] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (Jan 2001)
[23] D. V. Else, S. D. Bartlett, and A. C. Doherty, New Journal of Physics **14**, 113016 (2012)
[24] S. O. Skrøvseth and S. D. Bartlett, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022316 (Aug 2009)
[25] A. C. Doherty and S. D. Bartlett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 020506 (Jul 2009)
[26] J. K. Pachos and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 056402 (Jul 2004)
[27] L. E. Danielsen, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0503236(2005)
[28] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Physical review letters **96**, 110405 (2006)
[29] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (Mar 2006)
[30] J. Chen, Z. Ji, C.-K. Li, Y.-T. Poon, Y. Shen, N. Yu, B. Zeng, and D. Zhou, arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5046(2014)
[31] B. Zeng and X.-G. Wen, arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5090(2014)
[32] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010504 (Jul 2008)
[33] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (Jul 1996)
[34] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (Nov 1996)
[35] M. Grassl and M. Roetteler, in *Information Theory, 2007. ISIT 2007. IEEE International Symposium on* (IEEE, 2007) pp. 816–820
[36] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (Apr 2013)